

NOTICE OF PENDING LEGISLATION		DATE	5 April 1956
		LEGISLATIVE BILL NO.	S. [REDACTED] STATINTL
SECTION I		GENERAL	
TO : Mr. [REDACTED], Security Mr. [REDACTED], Personnel	FROM: LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL		
THE ATTACHED BILL, WHICH HAS BEEN INTRODUCED INTO CONGRESS, IS: <input type="checkbox"/> SENT TO YOU FOR INFORMATION ONLY. <input type="checkbox"/> A BILL ON WHICH FAVORABLE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION <input type="checkbox"/> IS <input type="checkbox"/> IS NOT PREDICTED. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SENT FOR YOUR COMMENT AS TO WHETHER IT IS OF INTEREST TO CIA ACTIVITIES, AND WHETHER FURTHER ACTION BY THIS OFFICE IS NECESSARY OR DESIRED. <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> IT IS REQUESTED THAT COMMENTS CONCERNING THIS LEGISLATION BE FORWARDED, THROUGH APPROPRIATE CHANNELS, TO THIS OFFICE, BY _____ </div>			
SECTION II		COMMENTS (From Original Addressee)	
TO : LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL	FROM: [REDACTED] Deputy Director of Security (Investigations & Support)		
<h2>OGC HAS REVIEWED.</h2> <p>Reference is made to your memorandum dated 23 September 1953 addressed to Mr. Roger W. JONES, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, Washington 25, D.C., and to subsequent conversations between a representative of this office and Mr. PFORZHEIMER regarding Mrs. [REDACTED] claim.</p> <p>It is the understanding of this office that subsequent to the referenced conversations, early in 1955, the claim was heard by the Bureau of Employees Compensation and denied on the basis that the Subject's death did not occur in the performance of duty. It is also believed that the case was heard by the Employees Compensation Appeals Board and denied on the same grounds.</p> <p>This office feels that consideration should be given to the possibility of intervention by your office before the bill is reported out of committee. At this time, it may be appropriate to present to the committee the information disclosed to the Bureau of the Budget in your memorandum of 23 September 1953 referred to above.</p> <p>This office believes that the foregoing is advisable because of the existence of security information in the records of the Department of the Army which bears on the Subject's former association with this Agency, which association, however, had no connection with his death. It is also believed that such action would be desirable because of the adverse publicity that might arise should this matter be heard in open court.</p>			
DATE OF COMMENTS		EXTENSION	
21 May 1956		[REDACTED]	

It is desirable to avoid the contingency whereby it will be necessary, if this bill becomes law, to appropriately brief the Court of Claims in an attempt to control the dissemination of the above-mentioned Department of the Army information.

Please contact this office if you have any questions concerning our position in this matter.

1 June 1956
STATINTL
After discussing with [REDACTED] and Kirk-
patrick, determined no agency action should be taken
on this bill. Pointed out that DCI was already
on record as not opposing previous bill, and although
the content of the new bill is different, any attempt
to oppose it would be embarrassing to Agency.
USP